

REMARKS

Claims 14-39 remain in the present application. Claims 36-39 are added herein. Claims 14, 17, 19-22, 24, 27 and 33-35 are amended herein. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on April 16, 2009 between Examiner Joanne Silbermann and Applicants' representatives Bryan M. Failing and Anthony C. Murabito. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on April 16, 2009 that the claim amendments made herein would be sufficient to overcome the drawing objections and the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections. It was also agreed during the Examiner Interview on April 16, 2009 that Witehira does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements including "wherein said second display screen is further operable to display said second image for viewing from a first viewing angle and contemporaneously for reducing visibility of said second image from a second viewing angle" as recited in independent Claim 14, the combination of elements including "wherein said optical component is further operable to enable viewing of said second image from a first viewing angle and contemporaneously operable to reduce visibility of said second image from a second viewing angle" as recited in independent Claim 22, and the combination of elements including "wherein said second display screen is further operable to display said second image in a first plurality of regions of said second

display screen, wherein said second display screen is further operable to display a third image in a second plurality of regions of said second display screen, wherein said first and second plurality of regions are interlaced” as recited in independent Claim 27. Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting the interview.

Drawing Objections

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on April 16, 2009 that the claim amendments made herein would be sufficient to overcome the drawing objections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 20 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on April 16, 2009 that the claim amendments made herein would be sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 20 and 34 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 14-18, 22-23 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by International Patent Application WO 99/42,889 to

Witehira et al. (referred to herein as “Witehira”). It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on April 16, 2009 that Witehira does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements including “wherein said second display screen is further operable to display said second image for viewing from a first viewing angle and contemporaneously for reducing visibility of said second image from a second viewing angle” as recited in independent Claim 14, the combination of elements including “wherein said optical component is further operable to enable viewing of said second image from a first viewing angle and contemporaneously operable to reduce visibility of said second image from a second viewing angle” as recited in independent Claim 22, and the combination of elements including “wherein said second display screen is further operable to display said second image in a first plurality of regions of said second display screen, wherein said second display screen is further operable to display a third image in a second plurality of regions of said second display screen, wherein said first and second plurality of regions are interlaced” as recited in independent Claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 14, 22 and 27 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Witehira, and therefore, are allowable. Since Claims 15-18, 23 and 28-32 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15-18, 23 and 28-32 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Witehira. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 14-18, 22-23 and 27-32 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 19-21, 24-26 and 33-35

Claims 19-21, 24-26 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witehira. Since Claims 19-21, 24-26 and 33-35 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 19-21, 24-26 and 33-35 are not rendered obvious by Witehira. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 19-21, 24-26 and 33-35 are allowable.

Claims 36-39

Since it was agreed during the Examiner Interview on April 16, 2009 that Witehira does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements including “wherein said second display screen is further operable to display said second image in a first plurality of regions of said second display screen, wherein said second display screen is further operable to display a third image in a second plurality of regions of said second display screen, wherein said first and second plurality of regions are interlaced” as recited in independent Claim 27, Applicant respectfully submits that Witehira also fails to teach or suggest the elements of “wherein said first plurality of pixels are operable to present a first image for viewing from a first viewing angle, wherein said second plurality of pixels are operable to present a second image for viewing from a second viewing angle, wherein said first viewing angle is different from said second viewing angle, and wherein said first and second plurality of pixels are interlaced” as recited in independent Claim 36. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that

independent Claim 36 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Witehira.
Since Claims 37-39 recite further elements of the invention claimed in
independent Claim 36, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 37-39 are also
not rendered obvious by Witehira.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14-39 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 5 / 26 / 2009

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060